DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 774 48 JC 750 127

TITLE	Future Think Program, San Jose City College, Spring Semester, 1974: Final Report of Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	DCM Associates, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; San Jose City Coll., Calif.
PUB DATE	Aug 74
GRANT	OEG-0-74-0489
NOTE	40p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Futures (of Society); Humanism; Humanistic Education; *Junior Colleges; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Content; *Program Evaluation; Social Values; Sociology; *World Affairs; World Problems
IDENTIFIERS	U N Universal Declaration of Human Rights

ABSTRACT

San Jose City College's Future Think Program consists of the following courses: Language, Culture, and Change; Third World Since 1945; Marriage and Family; Ecology and Man; Science Fiction; Introduction to Literature: Science Fiction; Introduction to Sociology; and Sociology/Fiction of the Future. An evaluation by an independent consulting firm was based on student responses to a comprehensive course and program evaluation instrument and on classroom observations. The 367 students completing the survey gave a favorable assessment of the program, courses, and instructors. They believed futuristics to be an important curriculum topic, felt their study had favorably affected their own thinking and planning for the future, and felt more responsible for the future of society. In-class observations showed that instructors were creative in melding instructional strategies to the requirements of the topic. To determine the integration of program materials with the general field of futuristics and global perspectives, students were asked to list which of the Articles of the U. N. Declaration of Human Rights were related to their courses and which were not. Their responses tended to concur with the stated objectives of the course, but the students were only moderately optimistic about the chances for achievement of goals in world affairs. (MJK)

ED101774

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FUTURE THINK PROGRAM

SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE
SPRING SEMESTER, 1974

Mr. William Jacobs
Director

Mr. James Gray
Associate Director

FINAL REPORT OF EVALUATION

by

DCM ASSOCIATES
San Francisco, California

Mr. David C. Miller
Co-Director of Evaluation

Dr. Ronald L. Hunt
Co-Director of Evaluation

Submission date of Final Report: 12 August 1974

U.S.O.E. GRANT NUMBER : OEG-0-74-0489

JC 750 127

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	1
BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES	2
SECTION I: SUMMARY OF IN-CLASS OBSERVATIONS	4
General Remarks Based on Classroom Observers' Reports	6
SECTION II: SUMMARY OF STUDENT RESPONSES TO SURVEY ASSESSMENT	8
SECTION III: APPLICATION OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS TO THE FUTURE THINK PROGRAM COURSES	15
TABLES	9
Table I: Summary of Personal Data, 367 Students	9
Table II: Summary of Student Opinion	11
Table III: Summary of Student Estimates of Applicability of UN UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS to Future Think Program.	16
Table IV: Recapitulation of Table III	17
Table V: Summary of Student Selection of Articles from UN DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS	18
Table VI: Summary of Student Selection of Articles from UN DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS for Addition to Future Think Program Courses	19
APPENDICES	21
A DCM ASSOCIATES: STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS	21
B CLASSROOM OBSERVER'S REPORT: Part I, Master List of Observation Items	23
Part II, Half-Hour Interval Observation Report Form	24
C FUTURE THINK PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE	25
D UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS	33
E UN DECLARATION ARTICLES RELATED TO TOPICS ACTUALLY COVERED	35
F UN DECLARATION ARTICLES TOPICS NOT COVERED WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN	36
G RESULTS FROM BLOCK B, FUTURE THINK PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE	37
H FUTURE THINK PROGRAM COURSE OUTLINES	38

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DCM ASSOCIATES
908 FOX PLAZA
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

FUTURE THINK PROGRAM

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Results of the DCM Associates Survey of the Future Think Program at San Jose City College clearly indicated a strong, favorable reaction of students to the nine courses offered, to the instructors, and to the idea of future studies at the college level. In only one instance did student evaluations tend to be negative with respect to a series of positive statements about the Program, instruction, and content. This was in regard to career planning; not a part of the stated objectives of any of the curriculum offerings.

Students believed that the study of the future was important to themselves and society, found the instruction and instructors interesting, and want more opportunities to study in the field. The students were able to identify, from a list of thirty human objectives, stated in the United Nations' UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, those Articles which best approximated the published objectives of the courses, and were also able--to a lesser degree--to recommend new content that might be added to specific courses based on the Articles.

The 367 students completing the survey instrument represent an average age of 27 years, have completed nearly 14 years of school, and in the majority, plan to go on to a college or university degree. Most of the students are employed, the majority on a full time basis. Their comments in open-ended sections of the evaluation instrument suggest a high degree of social awareness and concern and a willingness to be involved.

One result of the courses, as reflected by their reaction to questions regarding the chances that the DECLARATION'S Articles would--or would not--be achieved was that the students tended to move to more moderate, or realistic, appraisals of possible world futures, and tending less to extreme opinions.

While the purpose of the evaluation was to look at the total Future Think Program, and not to evaluate the individual courses, the survey and observations did provide information that should be of assistance to the Program directors and the individual course instructors. This information is contained in the forms, which have been sorted by course number. The student personal information data has been removed from each form to insure confidentiality.

Students were asked to make recommendations regarding possible improvements in the specific courses, and to indicate the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

strongest parts of the sections they were attending.

A review of these open-ended narrative statements by students indicated a few general observations:

1. Students were supportive and positive in their attitudes toward the courses and the instructors and were willing, in the main, to make recommendations.

2. Students particularly appreciated the opportunities to have community speakers and other guests and requested more.

3. Students, in the main, praised the quality of instruction and appreciated the openness of the classroom environment and the enthusiasm of the instructors.

4. Students appreciated the use of the films and video tapes and asked for more; however, they recommended that some of the films and other programs be more carefully screened to insure better quality.

5. Many students recommended smaller class size, or that classes be divided into smaller discussion groups more often than is presently done.

6. Students did not demonstrate a sense of attachment to the total Program, but more identification to the individual courses.

7. Some students were critical that some classes did not begin on time, or ended early. They recommended that small group discussions could be successfully used to run out the time of a session that might end early.

BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

Instruction in the Future Think Program at San Jose City College began in Spring Semester, 1974 under USOE Grant No. OEG-0-74-0489 (P.L. 85-864, Title VI as amended by P.L. 92-318 (Sec.601)). Program evaluation was required under terms of the grant. Following negotiations early in 1974, DCM Associates, San Francisco was retained by San Jose City College in mid-semester to evaluate the first semester's instructional program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DCM Associates is a private, for-profit futures education publishing and consulting firm headquartered in San Francisco, California. A statement of DCMA's qualifications and those of personnel participating in the present evaluation is given in APPENDIX A to this Evaluation Report.

In several meetings with Future Think Program Director Mr. William Jacobs, Co-Director Mr. James Gray, and members of the Program staff, an evaluation strategy was agreed upon and implemented. A sequential listing of evaluative activities is given below:

1. DCMA Project Leaders Dr. Ronald L. Hunt and David C. Miller reviewed and analyzed existing Future Think Program documentation, including the proposal document, individual course syllabi, and other materials prepared by Future Think Program instructors.

2. A protocol, suitable instruments, and a schedule was prepared for actual in-class observation of every section of all courses offered in the Future Think Program. These forms appear as APPENDIX B to this Evaluation Report.

3. A panel of qualified futurists and futures course instructors was organized by DCMA from its roster of associates. As mentioned, a listing of project personnel with their qualifications is given in APPENDIX A.

4. Future Think classes were observed during the period April 29 through May 21, 1974, using the protocol, instruments, and observers previously designated.

5. DCMA Project Leaders Hunt and Miller, working closely with Future Think Program Directors Jacobs and Gray, developed a comprehensive course and program evaluation instrument to be completed by all students at semester's end. This instrument was administered by Future Think instructors during the final week of classes and delivered by them directly to DCMA for analysis. The instrument incorporated items reflecting Program staff's evaluative requirements as well as DCMA's assessment objectives. This instrument is reproduced in APPENDIX C. A total of 367 students representing virtually all students enrolled completed and returned the instrument.

Briefly, such was the background of the Evaluation Project. In the following two sections, "Summary of In-Class Observations," and "Summary of Student Responses to Survey Assessment," are reported.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION I: SUMMARY OF IN-CLASS OBSERVATIONS, FUTURE THINK PROGRAM

Nine courses in the Spring, 1974 semester of the Future Think Program at San Jose City College were observed by the six DCMA observers listed in APPENDIX A during the period April 29 through May 21, 1974. Observation protocol and instruments used were those given in APPENDIX B. In the following sub-sections, brief summaries of individual class observations are given. The final sub-section offers some general remarks based on in-class observations overall.

Language 1: Language, Culture, Change (May 21)

Class featured graduate student guest lecturer from the Stanford University Chinese Studies Program, dealt with concept of homogenous vs. heterogeneous cultures, and the problems of cultural assimilation as exemplified presently by the Han Chinese efforts to incorporate other cultures on its borders. A great deal of information was presented, and the class represented an excellent exploitation of rich community resources, even though the guest was an inexperienced and often uncertain instructor. No direct attempt was made in this session to relate class content to the future, although the relations are obvious and may have been developed subsequently.

History 50: Third World Since 1945 (May 1)

Essentially a fast-paced, well-organized, well-received lecture session. Instructor collected term papers due that day, and most students had them. An open, cordial atmosphere was maintained. Students attended the lecture well, reacted with comments and questions which were used by instructor to present additional, related material, especially several paperback books he had just read and urged students to read. While information flow was heavily one way, the class was effective and clearly enjoyed by the instructor and most students alike. No direct tie was made to the future explicitly.

Psychology 94: Marriage and the Family (April 30)

Class devoted to discussion of open marriage and parental attitudes in the family, based on the new book SHIFTING GEARS. Brief use is made of an eye-messages exercise form, and two tapes based on the book are played. Circle format prompts discussion; only half the class actively participates but with two or three exceptions all seem actively interested. One student tends to dominate discussion, instructor strives to maintain low profile so that most information flow is between students. Interest

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and participation increase as class proceeds, somewhat interrupted by playing of tapes at end of class. No explicit tie-in is made to the future, although implications for future are clear.

Biology 63: Ecology and Man (May 1 and April 29)

In both sections, current local political and other news events were cited from papers and magazines. Lecture method used heavily, although pace was moderate and students were afforded (and used) opportunities to raise questions and make comments. One class was large and the classroom was quite hot, creating attention problems. Instructor made effective use of humor and strong statements of personal convictions to stimulate questions and thought. No explicit reference was made to the future.

English 1-A: Science Fiction (May 8)

A small, informally conducted class which effectively promoted general, intense discussion of contemporary America by relating the present to a discussion of assigned science fiction stories from the text. Instructor reports that attendance by enrolled students has dwindled because of the term paper required in all English 1 classes. A few students in class requested more structure in assignments and class, but most students as well as the instructor seem to enjoy and profit by the approach taken.

English 1-B: Introduction to Literature:Science Fiction (May 1)

Class devoted to the topic of mind expansion through meditation and use of drugs. Instructor relied primarily on the discussion mode. He showed great skill in relating the text (Huxley) to his own and to the students'personal experience and views, and in keeping the discussion clearly on course when it threatened to wander. A blackboard diagram presented at the beginning of class clarified class objectives well and kept it before the students. A high rapport existing among students and between them and instructor, with much two-way sharing and learning.

Sociology 10: Introduction to Sociology (May 7)

A large class (43 students) devoted to conveying information about growth and development of cities and about education. Lecture mode used, organized around blackboard graphics. Eventually, questioning of students by instructor elicited participation by about one-quarter of the class. Student interest and attention improved as the class proceeded. Mention of final exam date. Given class size, experience was as effective as might be expected, although interaction was little feasible.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sociology 13/English 69: Sociology/Fiction of the Future (April 30 and May 2

Both sections are large (45 and 50 students). One section has six Future Think instructors, the other has two. Both sections featured videotape lecture by Lord Ritchie Calder from the ETV series, "The Next Billion Years." Videotape quality poor, program format of a lecture in a British accent often difficult to follow for many students. Auditorium setting for one section not conducive to good discussion. In one section, a real and successful attempt was made to elicit student views about the future in reaction to those given on the videotape. Further, the concept of scenarios for alternative futures was introduced and treated effectively in small discussion groups. In the six-instructor session, instructors tended to dominate after-film discussion. Taken in all, this course more than others actively introduces and deals with "the future". Large class size and the physical and programmatic quality of the videotape detracted from the quality of the experience overall.

General Remarks Based on Classroom Observers' Reports

Future Think instructors appear to be creative in melding a blend of instructional strategies to the requirements of the topic, personal teaching styles, and the severe constraints imposed in many cases by large classes.

Cited in the observer reports above are the following instructional techniques: conventional lecture, colloquia, team teaching, invited guest lecturer representing community resource, appropriate feature films, in-class exercises, videotapes, and audiotapes.

"This instructor and all others should attempt to relate lecture material to Future Think. I don't believe the word 'future' was mentioned at any time. I sense one important deficiency existing in the courses I observed: an integrating concept or idea about the future. This course and the others I observed could be taken without ever knowing the relation of one to the others. There should be frequent reference to integrating concepts."

And another observer: "It's now been two days since I was on City College campus, and I'd like to make some general comments about Future Think and the instructors I visited. We discussed in detail how this program came into being, how it was operating at present and where it was heading...

"All the instructors commented directly on their subject's relationship to the future. They invited and encouraged students to consider the consequences and implications of a particular action or event both from a personal and a collective standpoint.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The global perspective was never lost sight of. In addition and perhaps most importantly, each was a warm and empathetic person in the classroom. A warm and comfortable rapport existed between them and their students. That attitudinal environment was conducive to learning.

"My next remarks are open-ended questions and not intended as criticism of the Future Think Program. Rather, they are reflections about futures programs in general. As I am involved in one, these are questions I ponder often, without much resolution.

"We call our programs 'future', and so the content may be, but is the method? Have we altered teaching styles or learning modes? Are there innovations in teaching methods? Should there be? If we purport to teach about the 'future,' should our techniques be new? I feel the core questions are these:

"How do we teach people how to learn? To sort out the wheat from the chaff? To identify, categorize, clarify? To ask their own questions? To know where to go to find what they want to know? To trust their own curiosity and intuition? How does somebody get 'turned on'?

"I have no answers to these questions, just the questions. I'd like to explore them with other learners someday."

Such were the major outcomes of the DCMA classroom observations of the Future Think Program. We turn next to the evaluation instrument completed by most students in the Program during the last week of the Spring, 1974 Semester and forwarded directly to DCMA for analysis.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF STUDENT RESPONSES TO SURVEY ASSESSMENT FUTURE THINK PROGRAM

A DCMA survey instrument was completed by 367 students enrolled in the courses Sociology 10, Sociology 13, Psychology 94, English 69, English 1-A, English 1-B, Language 1, Biology 63, and History 50 in the Future Think Program during the week ending Spring Semester.

Personal Data

The average age of students in the program was 27.6 years of these 56% were male and 43% female. The average student had completed 13.9 years of school; 84% stating plans to go on to higher education. Of the students employed, 65% were working full time and 34% part time. Types of occupations ranged from 25% professional, 24% technical, 39% semi-skilled and 11% unskilled.

Distribution of students completing the survey, by course, was as follows:

	Number
Biology 63	89
English 1-A	23
English 1-B	20
English 69	32
History 50	55
Language 1	25
Psychology 94	46
Sociology 10	97
Sociology 13	71
No reply	15
Total	473*

Most students (265) in the Future Think Program were taking only one course, while 74 students stated that they were taking two, and 10 students three courses. Three students indicated that they were taking four courses in the Program in the same semester.

Course(s) Evaluation

The overwhelming majority of students reacted favorably to the Future Think Program. Support of the Program was evident in student responses in Block D of the survey and in their open-ended evaluations and recommendations. These narrative comments are being returned to the instructors without student personal data attached to insure the complete confidentiality of the statements.

*Includes responses for more than one course on a single form.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE I

Summary of personal data, 367 students,
Future Think Program, San Jose City College
Spring Semester, 1974

Age: 27.6 years

Number of school years completed: 14

Employed this semester: No: 27% (100)* Yes: 72% (266)

Fulltime: 65% (172) Parttime 34%(90)

Type of employment:

Professional: 25% (66) Technical: 24% (63)

Semi-skilled: 39% (104) Unskilled: 10% (28)

How much further do you intend to pursue your formal education:

Ph.D.: 7% (26) M.A.: 18% (66) M.S.: 4% (14)

B.A. : 32%(117) B.S.: 16% (57) Certificate: 2% (6) A.A.: 13% (49)

No degree or certificate: 4% (14) Other: 4% (13)

Female: 43% (158) Male: 56% (204)

Enrollment in individual courses:

Biology 63: 24% (89)

English 1-A: 6% (23)

English 1-B: 5% (20)

English 69: 9% (32)

History 50: 15% (55)

Language 1: 7% (25)

Psychology 94:13% (46)

Sociology 10: 26% (97)

Sociology 13: 19% (71)

* *numbers in ( ) indicate number of students giving this response*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In Block D of the instrument, students were asked to rate a series of positive statements about the Program, instructors, content of the courses, and the relevance of the experiences to their lives and to society. Students rating a statement with the numeral 1 "emphatically agreed" with the statement; a 2 indicated that they "simply agreed"; 3 meant that the student "simply disagreed" with the statement, and a 4 represented "emphatic disagreement."

An examination of Table II reveals the students' strong approval of the courses, instructors, and Program.

Sixty-two percent of the students emphatically agreed, and 30 percent agreed, that: Item 8, "futurists and futures study are of great value to society;" 52% emphatically agreed and 41% agreed that they: Item 12, "would encourage other students to take one or more of the Future Think courses."

Forty-five percent of the students emphatically agreed, and 44% agreed that: Item 9, "the instructors were well prepared;" 35% emphatically agreed and 46% agreed that: Item 10, "the instructors excited and held their interests." Forty-nine percent emphatically agreed and 41% agreed that: Item 17 "more college courses should concentrate on the future;" and 58% emphatically agreed and 32% agreed that: Item 16, "a global perspective is necessary for everyone."

Additional favorable reaction to the Program was indicated by the students' emphatic agreement, 29%, and agreements 36%, with the statement, Item 19, "this has been one of the best course experiences in my college career," and 23% emphatically agreeing and 36% agreeing that, Item 18, "they planned to take other courses in the Future Think Program."

Another set of questions asked students to respond to statements that related to the effect the course or courses had on them personally. While students were less emphatic in their expressions of agreement in these statements, than those relating to the course content and instructors' performance, there was still a strong majority of students responding favorably to the statements.

Thirty-three percent emphatically agreed and 51% agreed that: Item 1, "my Future Think course(s) made me feel more responsible for shaping my own future;" and 23% emphatically agreed and 52% agreed that, Item 2 "the course(s) made them feel more responsible for shaping society's future." This feeling of responsibility carried over to a similar agreement, 19% emphatic and 44% simple agreement, with the belief that, Item 5, "they would feel more responsible toward other nations of the world." It should be

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE II

Summary of student opinion (367 students)
Future Think Program, San Jose City College, Spring Semester, 1974

1 = emphatically agree 2 = simply agree 3 = simply disagree 4 = emphatically disagree 5 = other

QUESTIONS	RATINGS				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. My Future Think course(s) made me feel more responsible for shaping my own future.	33% (119) *	51% (183)	9% (32)	1% (6)	5% (17)
2. My Future Think course(s) made me feel more responsible for shaping society's future.	23% (82)	52% (186)	17% (61)	3% (11)	5% (18)
3. My Future Think course(s) have given me more help in planning my life effectively than have other courses I have taken.	19% (68)	41% (146)	30% (107)	7% (24)	4% (14)
4. I have done more reading in the Future Think course(s) than in other course(s).	22% (77)	23% (82)	38% (137)	14% (49)	4% (13)
5. My Future Think course(s) have made me feel more responsible towards other world nations.	19% (69)	44% (159)	27% (97)	5% (19)	4% (15)
6. I have done more thinking in the Future Think course(s) than in other college courses I've had.	26% (92)	32% (114)	28% (101)	7% (26)	7% (24)

(Table II continued next page)

* *numbers in ( ) indicate number of students giving this response*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE II (continued)

1 = emphatically agree 2 = simply agree 3 = simply disagree 4 = emphatically disagree 5 = other

QUESTIONS	RATINGS 1	2	3	4	5
7.My Future Think course(s) have caused me to modify my own lifestyle.	13% (47)	36% (128)	38% (136)	10% (36)	3% (11)
8.Futurists and futures studies are of great value to society.	62% (223)	30% (108)	3% (11)	2% (7)	2% (8)
9.My instructor(s) in this course was well prepared.	45% (162)	44% (159)	2% (10)	3% (9)	4% (16)
10.My instructor(s) excited and held my interest.	35% (126)	46% (166)	10% (35)	3% (12)	5% (18)
11.Having taken this Future Think course(s),I understand human nature better.	15% (53)	60% (217)	18% (68)	4% (14)	3% (12)
12.I would encourage other students to take one or more Future Think courses.	51% (187)	41% (147)	3% (12)	2% (6)	1% (5)
13.Now that I have had a Future Think course(s), I am better able to plan my own life.	10% (37)	50% (178)	32% (113)	4% (13)	3% (12)
14.Now that I have had a Future Think course(s), I better understand world affairs.	20% (73)	46% (165)	27% (97)	4% (15)	2% (7)

TABLE II (continued)

1 = emphatically agree 2 = simply agree 3 = simply disagree 4 = emphatically disagree 5 = other

QUESTIONS	RATINGS 1	2	3	4	5
15. My Future Think course(s) has helped me to plan my own career more intelligently.	9% (32)	32% (115)	46% (162)	9% (33)	4% (13)
16. A global perspective is necessary for everyone.	58% (207)	32% (114)	7% (24)	1% (5)	3% (9)
17. More college courses should concentrate on the future.	49% (176)	41% (146)	6% (23)	1% (5)	3% (9)
18. I plan to take other courses in the Future Think Program.	28% (96)	36% (127)	20% (70)	5% (16)	11% (39)
19. This has been one of the best course experiences in my college career.	29% (101)	36% (127)	24% (85)	7% (23)	5% (17)

End of Table II

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

noted that 27% disagreed with the greater feeling of world responsibility as a result of the course(s).

In terms of personal preparation for life, the course(s) received more mixed reactions from the students. In response to the statement, Item 3, "My Future Think course(s) have given me more help in planning my life effectively than have other courses I have taken before, " 19% emphatically agreed, 41% agreed, and 30% disagreed. Thirty-eight percent of the students did not believe that, Item 7, "the course(s) had caused them to modify their lifestyle,"while a total of 49% either agreed or strongly agreed. In response to the statement, Item 11, "Having taken this Future Think course(s), I understand human nature better now," 15% emphatically agreed, 60% agreed, and 18% disagreed.

The value of the course(s) in personal planning was reflected in statement, Item 13, "Now that I have had a Future Think course(s) I am better able to plan my own life," to which 10% emphatically agreed, 50% agreed, and 32% disagreed. Students placed less value on the statement, Item 15, "My Future Think course(s) has helped me to plan my own career more intelligently," with only 9% emphatically agreeing, 32% agreeing, and 46% disagreeing.

While still positive, statements relating to the students' assessment of their own performance rated lowest of all. In response to the statement, Item 4, "I have done more reading in the Future Think course(s) than in other courses I've taken," 38% disagreed, 23% agreed, and 22% emphatically agreed. In a more favorable sense, students felt that they had done more thinking in the Future Think course(s) than other courses they had taken. To this, 26% emphatically agreed, 32% agreed, and 28% disagreed.Finally, 20% of the students emphatically agreed, and 46% agreed, that they, Item 14, "had a better understanding of world affairs as a result of being involved in the Program."

From these responses, there can be little doubt that the students engaged in the Future Think Program find the experience of definite instructional and personal value. They praise the quality of instruction. It is only in the single question concerning the relationship of the course(s) to career planning that there are more negative than positive responses. It is possible that this is a realistic appraisal of the fact that career planning was not one of the objectives of the courses, or the Program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION III: APPLICATION OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS TO THE FUTURE THINK PROGRAM COURSES

In addition to gleaning information from the students concerning their evaluation of the various courses in the Future Think Program, the administrators of this study felt it important to find out if there were general, unifying concepts that were being conveyed. While it is not always difficult to measure the achievement of objectives in a single course, the analysis of several diverse courses under one program is a challenge. It was decided, therefore, to use a general set of human and individual goals, or objectives, to which the students in the Program would, or would not, identify, and apply in the description of the course, or courses, they had taken. To achieve that end, the United Nations UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS was selected. Its thirty Articles contain the aspirations of that world body for mankind, and seem still to be acceptable as goals for humanity. (See APPENDIX D).

In applying the Articles to the courses, students were asked to list, after each course taken, the Article numbers as first, second, and third choices representing "topics actually covered in the course." In addition, students were asked for their three choices of Articles representing "topics NOT covered in this course which should have been." The result of their choices is shown in Table III and Table IV.

There were two other purposes in using the DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS in this survey. First, was it possible that out of thirty Articles that students would show clear indications of agreement on topics, both in terms of what was in the course and what should have been? Second, did the effect of the Future Think Program have a tendency to change students' world outlook in positive, or negative, directions or have no effect? Definite results were achieved in both instances.

Students tended to select Articles as relating to the courses in congruence with the objectives for each of the courses and were also able to identify Articles that came in close agreement with the published course content. (See Table V and Table VI).

For example, Article 16, "the right to marry and found a family," was the first choice of most students in the Program. In reviewing course outlines in Sociology and Psychology, it was noted that several of the courses placed an emphasis on the nuclear family as a basis for looking at the future of society. The second most chosen Article was 1, declaring that, "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights." This Article reflected the emphasis in English 69, History 50, and English 1-B.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE III

Summary of student estimates of the applicability of The United Nations Universal Declaration Of Human Rights to the Future Think Program, San Jose City College, Spring Semester, 1974

In your personal opinion, which of the 30 Articles in the Universal Declaration Of Human Rights were:

A. Related to topics actually covered in this course:

Course:	First choice: Article Number+	N*	Second choice: Article Number+	N*	Third choice: Article Number+	N*
Sociology 13	16	28	1	25	24	19
English 69	1	11	28	9	2,25	7
History 50	1	19	2	16	4	11
Sociology 10	16	47	2	34	26	28
Biology 63	25	42	21	17	29	14
Psychology 94	16	23	1	10	19,25	9
English 1 A	19	9	18	6	1,26	5
English 1 B	1	9	19	7	2	6
Language 1	26	7	3	6	25	4

B. Topics not covered in this course which should have been:

Sociology 13	14	10	11,13	7	1,5,21	5
English 69	22	8	15,25	5	14	4
History 50	14,15	7	17	5	x	x
Sociology 10	25	9	12,29	8	15,23	7
Biology 63	26	7	1,22	6	x	x
Psychology 94	25	5	24	4	x	x
English 1 A	x	x	x	x	x	x
English 1 B	x	x	x	x	x	x
Language 1	x	x	x	x	x	x

*N = number of students giving this estimate
x = responses too few to report
+ the Articles are reproduced by Number in an Appendix to this Evaluation Report--see Table of Contents

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE IV

Recapitulation Of Table III:
Articles in the Universal Declaration Of Human Rights
which are related to courses
or which should be added to courses
in the Future Think Program, San Jose City College
in the opinion of students enrolled in the Spring, 1974 semester

A. Related to courses:

Rank:	First choice: Article Number+	N*	Second choice: Article Number +	N*	Third Choice: Article Number +	N*
1.	16	80	2	50	26	33
2.	1	39	1	36	25	20
3.	25	25	21	17	24	19
4.	19	9	28	9	29	14
5.	26	7	19	7	2	13
6.	x	x	3,18	6	4	11
7.	x	x	x	x	19	9
8.	x	x	x	x	1	5

B. Should be added to courses:

1.	14	17	12,29	8	15,23	7
2.	25#	14	11,13	7	1,5,21	5
3.	22	8	1,22	6	14	4
4.	15	7	15,25,17	5	x	x
5.	26	7	24	4	x	x

(# recommended for English 68, Sociology 10, Psychology 94)

C. Articles most often mentioned:

Related to courses:	Should be added:
1. Article 16 (80)	1. Article 14 (21)
2. Article 1 (79)	2. Articles 17,25 (10)
3. Article 25 (65)	3. Article 22 (14)

*N = number of students giving this estimate x = responses too few to report
+ the Articles are reproduced by Number in an Appendix to this Report—see Table of Contents

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE V

Summary of student selection of Articles from the Universal Declaration Of Human Rights judged related to courses in the Future Think Program, San Jose City College, Spring, 1974

FIRST CHOICE:

Article Number and Summary:	Course
16. The right to marry with full consent of intending spouses, and raise a family as a protected fundamental group unit of society.	Sociology 13 Sociology 10 Psychology 94
1. All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights and should act in the spirit of brotherhood.	English 69 History 50 English 1 B
25. The right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of the family.	Biology 63
19. The right of freedom of expression.	English 1 A
26. The right to an education.	Language 1

SECOND CHOICE:

1. see summary above.	Sociology 13 Psychology 94
2. All rights enjoyed regardless of race, color, sex, etc., including political freedom.	History 50 Sociology 10 Biology 63
18. Freedom of thought, conscience, and religion	English 1 A
19. see summary above.	English 1 B
3. Right to life, liberty, and security of person.	Language 1
28. Right to social and international order until rights are achieved.	English 69

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE VI

Summary of student selection of Articles from the Universal Declaration Of Human Rights for addition to courses in the Future Think Program, San Jose City College, Spring, 1974

Article Number and Summary:	Course:
14. Right to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.	Sociology 13 History 50
15. Right to a nationality.	History 50
22. Right to social security, economic,cultural, and social rights, and freedom to develop personality.	English 69
25. The right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of the family.	Sociology 10 Psychology 94
26. The right to an education.	Biology 63

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The first choice in Biology 63 was Article 25, "...the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family, etc." which was in line with the topics of ecology and environment stressed in that part of the Program.

Students felt that Articles 14, "...the right to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution," and 25, "the right to a standard of living,"should have received greater stress in some of the courses.

Instructors will wish to examine the Articles, and those selected by students, as they relate to their own courses. These Articles may also provide a valuable point of discussion for the total Future Think Program staff in seeking greater unity in the Program.

The survey was also interested in determining the effect the courses had on student optimism or pessimism relating to world affairs. Following their assignment of Articles of the DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS to the various courses in the Program, students were asked to indicate their estimates of the chances that the goals would be achieved. They also were asked to estimate their rating of the chances if they were completing the survey BEFORE taking the course(s). The items and the student responses follow:

"Now that you have read and thought about the UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, and also have taken a Future Think Course(s), we would like you to 'play futurist' for us by giving us your personal predictions about the human rights mentioned in the DECLARATION. Please answer the following question by checking ONE REPLY ONLY: "In my opinion, the chances of attaining reasonably well most of the human rights mentioned in the DECLARATION by the Year 2000 A.D. are: 57 Good, 143 Fair, 133 Poor, 12 None, 21 No Response.

"Now, one last question. Here it is: "If I had been asked the question above BEFORE TAKING THIS FUTURE THINK COURSE(S), I probably would have felt that the chances of attaining reasonably well most of the human rights mentioned in the DECLARATION by the Year 2000 A.D. are: 78 Good, 116 Fair, 115 Poor, 33 None, 24 No Response."

It should be noted that a greater spread of opinion was attributed by the students to their estimate of chances before taking the course(s). This is a typical reaction found in Delphi surveys after several iterations, and after reflection on the response of others. One might conjecture in looking at the students' responses to these items that they have moved to a greater position of reality, or on the other hand, to a more moderate posture with respect to world affairs in the future.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A

DCM ASSOCIATES: STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS

DCM ASSOCIATES, a private for-profit firm, was established in San Francisco in 1966 as a consulting and publishing organization. Since its inception, DCMA has concentrated its interests and activities in education and in futures research and futures studies. Current or recent assignments include:

1. Assisting a community college in designing, developing, securing authorization for, and implementing a campus-wide Interdepartmental Futures Education Program,

2. Organizing and directing a three-week futures education workshop jointly sponsored by a university and a major futures research organization.

3. For DCMA's own ADVENT futures education program, designing, developing, testing, and publishing an integrated set of learning materials for futures education, based on the curriculum developed for the field by ADVENT's co-directors, David C. Miller and Dr. Ronald L. Hunt.

4. As project consultant to a management planning consultant firm and to one of the nation's largest contract research organizations, assisting a large insurance holding company and a rail transport leasing corporation to apply Divergence Mapping to their top-management planning activities. Divergence Mapping, of which David C. Miller was a co-developer, is a systematic procedure for identifying significant alternative futures and assessing their potential impacts on organizational missions.

The evaluation of San Jose City College's Future Think Program was directed by David C. Miller and Dr. Ronald L. Hunt. Assisting in classroom observations were the following associates: Carl Cheyney, Jacques Locke, Thomas Mandel, and Dyan Howell Pyke. David Gilli directed computer data analysis.

DAVID C. MILLER is a nationally recognized futurist educator, consultant, and researcher. He is a charter member of the 15,000 member World Future Society, and a general editor of its periodical, The Futurist. In 1966 for San Francisco State University he directed one of the nation's first futures education workshops for teachers, "Technology and Education in the 21st Century" (subsequently the basis of a book by the same title). He has served as futures consultant to such organizations as the American Institute of Architects, The Boeing Company, The Weyerhaeuser Company, Transamerica Research Corporation, and the Puget Sound Governmental Conference. During 1972 and 1973, Mr. Miller was a founding partner of Pacific House, a futures studies consultant firm in Palo Alto, California. Since 1967, he has been Adjunct Professor in the futures-oriented graduate Cybernetic Systems Program at San Jose State University.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DR. RONALD L. HUNT is Professor of Instructional Technology in the School of Education, San Jose State University and President of Hunt Productions, San Jose. During 1966 and 1967, Dr. Hunt organized and directed a pioneering futures study of education in California for the State Committee on Public Education. Currently, Dr. Hunt is directing a multi-year project for a multi-national energy corporation, developing a series of multi-media learning materials about energy and the environment for use by public schools. Together with David C. Miller at San Jose State University during 1971-1973 Dr. Hunt directed the design, development, and test of a graduate curriculum in futures education. The project was sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education's first curriculum grant in the futures field. The curriculum is now in use in many colleges and universities and has been adopted by DCM Associates as the basis for its ADVENT futures education program, of which Dr. Hunt is co-director.

Mr. CARL CHEYNEY is on academic leave from the doctoral program at the University of California, San Diego where he developed an innovative and successful course in futures studies for underachieving undergraduates. Mr. Cheyney is engaged in developing a project emphasizing the future of the San Francisco Bay Area. He also is developing a community service futures education course in association with a community college and a directed-reading correspondence course for DCM Associates.

Mr. JACQUES LOCKE is a senior staff member in the Information Systems Group, Lockheed Missiles and Space Company, Sunnyvale. A graduate of the futures-oriented Cybernetic Systems Program at San Jose State University, Mr. Locke is preparing for a career in futures education at the community college level.

Mr. THOMAS MANDEL holds one of the first futures degrees ever awarded by a university from the University of Hawaii. He is currently on the project staff at the Center for the Study of Social Policy, Stanford Research Institute where he is participating in futures research projects in the fields of education and energy.

Ms. DYAN HOWELL PIKE is a faculty member in the Communications Department, College of Marin, Kentfield, California. In that capacity she has since its inception taught in and participated in the development of COM's nationally recognized futures instruction, an effort which has now culminated in what may be the nation's first interdepartmental futures education program at the community college level. Ms. Pike is presently co-authoring a futures textbook with Ms. Maryjane Dunstan and Ms. Patricia Garland whose earlier work, Worlds In The Making was the first undergraduate futures textbook published, and which is used in hundreds of colleges and secondary schools.

CONFIDENTIAL
PROPRIETARY
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

Classroom Observer's Report
San Jose City College Future Think Program, Spring, 1974

PART I: Master List of Observation Items

NOTE TO OBSERVER: The following items are the things we ask you to note in particular as you observe your class session. In addition, please record all other observations you believe will be useful to Program staff in improving and strengthening the Program next semester.

1. Was the instructor on time?
2. How many students were tardy?
3. Did class begin on time?
4. How many students in class?
5. How were the "vibes" before class?
6. How did the instructor begin class?
7. Were today's objectives clearly stated?
8. Was a homework assignment due?
9. How many students turned in assignment?
10. Which instructional mode was used primarily during this half-hour?
    (a) Lecture (b) Discussion (c) Other (specify)
11. What is the general level of student attention?
12. What is the general level of student participation?
13. Any use of visual aids? If YES, specify.
14. Any mention of other Future Think courses? If YES, specify which ones.
15. Is the instructor's major apparent objective to give information?
16. Is the instructor's major apparent objective to stimulate thought, discussion?
17. What other major objective does the instructor seem to have?
18. Is the "pace" of class rapid, moderate, or slow?
19. How well does class seem to meet instructor's demands?
20. How well does instructor seem to meet the class' demands?
21. Are you yourself learning something new about the future? If YES, please specify?
22. In what ways does the instructor's approach resemble your own?
23. In what ways is the instructor's approach most different from yours?
24. What percent of the information flow is FROM instructor TO class? FROM class TO instructor and class.
25. Does the instructor seem to be enjoying himself/herself?
26. Does the class seem to be enjoying itself?
27. What reference or use is made of text or other required materials?
28. Is a homework assignment given? If YES, do most students acknowledge and seem to understand the assignment?
29. What one thing have you learned in this class that you will use yourself?
30. What one thing would you like to suggest to this instructor?
31. What other general remarks or observations do you have? REVIEW THIS LIST TO PROMPT YOUR MEMORY.
32. Did the class end promptly?
33. Did some students stay after class to talk?

CONFIDENTIAL
PROPRIETARY

DCM ASSOCIATES
909 Fox Plaza
San Francisco, Ca 94102
415-626-3125

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART II:

HALF-HOUR INTERVAL OBSERVATION REPORT FORM

Course Title_____ Date_____ Observer_____

HALF-HOUR INTERVAL COVERED: From ___ : ___ To ___ : ___ Instructor_____

INSTRUCTIONS TO OBSERVER:
1. First, complete all items requested above.
2. Lay this Form beside PART I: Master List Of Observation Items
3. As class proceeds, scan the Master List repeatedly, ...
4. When a Master List item mentions something you are observing, jot the number of that item on the form, followed by your observation. Make your written comments as clear and complete as you can.
5. Pay special attention to Item 31.
6. When the half-hour interval is over, put aside this copy of the Form, get a fresh one, and begin again.
7. Use both sides of this Form if necessary. If so, please write "OVER" at the bottom of the page.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX C

DCH ASSOCIATES
[illegible]
San Francisco, Ca 94102
[illegible]

THIS IS NOT A TEST!

To: All students, Future Think Program
San Jose City College, Spring 1974

From: Dave Miller, DCH Associates

Any new educational program requires an assessment by an independent, qualified outside party. DCH Associates has been retained for this purpose by your instructors. Our job is to find out what worked, what didn't, how you the students feel about the course, and how it can be improved next year. To that end, this is your opportunity to make suggestions. This is not a test. You needn't sign the enclosed questionnaire unless you want to. After you have completed the questionnaire, please seal it in the envelope provided, and give it to your instructor. S/he will give it to us, unopened. Your instructor will never see your form, and your replies will have no effect on your course grade.

As a student in the Future Think Program, you are concerned about what life may be like in 1984, 2000, and even beyond. Having completed one semester in the program, you can contribute to the Program's future by telling us:

1. Who you are (including your name ONLY IF YOU WISH).
2. What you gained from the Future Think Program
3. What you recommend for making the Program even better next year.

We wish to express to you DCH Associates' appreciation for your help. Your instructor will also be grateful for your help. Most of all, students who enter the Future Think Program in the future will be appreciative of the contribution you have made toward improving the Program for them.

Now, please turn to the next page and begin.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONFIDENTIAL
PROPERTY

DCM ASSOCIATES
990 FOX PLAZA
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

THIS IS NOT A TEST!

PART I : WHO YOU ARE

BLOCK A : OPTIONAL. FILL IN THIS BLOCK ONLY IF YOU WISH TO.

1. Your name _____
2. Your address and home phone _____

_____

BLOCK B : All students MUST complete this Block.

3. Your age _____years.
4. No years of school completed as of June 1974. _____ YEARS
5. Are you employed this semester? ___NO ___YES
6. If employed, do you work ___ FULLTIME ___PARTTIME. (X one)
7. If employed, please check one of the Items below:
   - ___ a. Professional employment
   - ___ b. Technical employment
   - ___ c. Semi-skilled employment
   - ___ d. Unskilled employment
8. As of June, 1974, how many years of school will you have completed?

   ____ YEARS
9. Please X one block below to indicate how much farther you intend to pursue your formal education

   ___ a. Ph.D. ___ b. M.A. ___ c. M.S. ___ d. B.A.
   ___ e. B.S. ___ f. A.A. ___ g. certificate
   ___ h. no degree or certificate ___ i. other (please specify)
10. Please X one: ___ a. I am FEMALE ___ b. I am MALE.
11. In the list of Future Think courses below, please place an X beside each course you are enrolled in this semester:
    - ___ a. Biology 63
    - ___ b. English 1-A
    - ___ c. English 1-B
    - ___ d. English 69
    - ___ e. History 50
    - ___ f. Language 1
    - ___ g. Psychology 94
    - ___ h. Sociology 10
    - ___ i. Sociology 13

BEST COPY AVAILABLE
CONFIDENTIAL
PROPRIETARY

DCM ASSOCIATES
903 FOX PLAZA
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 9[illegible]

THIS IS NOT A TEST!

What You Gain
PART II : WHAT YOU GAINED FROM THE PROGRAM

BLOCK C : All students MUST complete this Block.

One of the best ways to find out for yourself what you have actually learned in a course is to use what you have learned in thinking about related ideas and materials you have never actually seen or thought about before. That is the course evaluation approach taken in this Block of the Questionnaire.

Along with this Questionnaire, you were given a printed copy of the UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

STOP RIGHT NOW AND TAKE THE TIME TO READ THROUGH THE DECLARATION CAREFULLY. YOU WILL BE ASKED A SERIES OF QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DECLARATION BELOW.

Now that you have finished reading the Universal Declaration Of Human Rights, let's see if the ideas in the Declaration can be related to the ideas presented in the Future Think course(s) you have taken. REMEMBER, THIS IS NOT A TEST. All we are trying to discover is whether or not the course may have helped clarify your ideas about such topics as human rights. Here is how we shall go about it:

On the next page, we have listed once again all the courses in the Future Think Program. PLEASE PLACE AN X BESIDE EACH COURSE YOU HAVE TAKEN THIS SEMESTER.

For each Future Think course you have taken, we want to have your opinion on two things:

1. Quickly reviewing the Human Rights in the Declaration, which Articles in the Declaration raise topics which were covered in the Course? For such topics, write the Article number from the Declaration in the space provided under "INCLUDED"

2. Looking through the Declaration once again and thinking about each Future Think course you have taken, which topics were NOT covered which SHOULD HAVE BEEN COVERED, in your opinion? Once again, write the Article number from the Declaration in the space provided uner "NOT INCLUDED BUT SHOULD HAVE BEEN."

If you have any question about what you are to do, please check with your Instructor. When you are ready, turn the page and begin.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DCM ASSOCIATES
968 FOX PLAZA
SAN FRANCISCO, CA

CONFIDENTIAL
PROPRIETARY

THIS IS NOT A TEST!

COURSE NUMBER	DID YOU TAKE IT?	IN YOUR PERSONAL OPINION, WHICH OF THE 30 ARTICLES IN THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS WERE: A. RELATED TO TOPICS ACTUALLY COVERED IN THIS COURSE: (Give Article Nos.)			B. TOPICS NOT COVERED IN THIS COURSE WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN (Give Article Nos.)		
COURSE NUMBER	DID YOU TAKE IT?						
Sociology 13	_____	A.	b.	c.	a.	b.	c.
English 69	_____	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.	c.
History 50	_____	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.	c.
Sociology 10	_____	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.	c.
Biology 63	_____	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.	c.
Psychology 94	_____	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.	c.
English 1 A	_____	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.	c.
English 1 B	_____	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.	c.
Language 1	_____	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.	c.

Now that you have read and thought about the UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, and also have taken a Future Think course(s), we would like you to "play futurist" for us by giving us your personal predictions about the human rights mentioned in the Declaration. Please answer the following question by checking ONE REPLY ONLY:

"In my opinion, the chances of attaining reasonably well most of the human rights mentioned in the Declaration by the Year 2000 A.D. are:

CHECK ONLY ONE REPLY HERE: ___Good ___Fair ___Poor ___None

Now, one last question. Here it is:

"If I had been asked the question above BEFORE TAKING THIS FUTURE THINK COURSE(S), I probably would have felt that the chances of attaining reasonably well most of the human rights mentioned in the Declaration by the Year 2000 A.D. are:

CHECK ONLY ONE REPLY HERE: ___Good ___Fair ___Poor ___None

That completes Block C. Now go on to Block D on the next page.

CONFIDENTIAL
PROPRIETARY BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THIS IS NOT A TEST!

BLOCK D: ALL STUDENTS MUST COMPLETE THIS BLOCK.

In this Block, you will be asked whether you agree or disagree with a number of statements about the Future Think Program. In expressing your agreement or disagreement, PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING RATING NUMBERS

A "1" means that YOU EMPHATICALLY AGREE with a statement.

A "2" means that you SIMPLY AGREE with a statement.

A "3" means that you SIMPLY DISAGREE with a statement.

A "4" means that you EMPHATICALLY DISAGREE with a statement.

A "5" means that you have SOME OTHER OPINION about the statement. (When you put down a "5", add a few words which expresses your personal opinion about the statement.)

QUESTION	How do YOU rate this statement? (1,2,3,4, or 5)
1. My Future Think course(s) made me feel more responsible for shaping my own future.	____
2. My Future Think course(s) made me feel more responsible for shaping society's future.	____
3. My Future Think course(s) have given me more help in planning my life effectively than have other courses I have taken before.	____
4. I have done more reading in the Future Think course(s) than in other courses I've taken.	____
5. My Future Think course(s) have made me feel more responsible towards other world nations.	____
6. I have done more thinking in the Future Think course(s) than in other college courses I've had.	____
7. My Future Think course(s) have caused me to modify my own lifestyle	____
8. Futurists and futures study are of great value to society.	____
9. My instructor(s) in this course(s) was well prepared	____
10. My instructor(s) excited and held my interest	____

Go on to the next page

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DCI ASSOCIATES
308 FOX PLAZA
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 9410?

THIS IS NOT A TEST!

CONFIDENTIAL
PROPRIETARY

QUESTION	How do YOU rate this statement? (1,2,3,4,or 5)
11. Having taken this Future Think course(s), I understand human nature better now.	____
12. I would encourage other students to take one or more Future Think courses.	____
13. Now that I have had a Future Think course(s), I am better able to plan my own life.	____
14. Now that I have had a Future Think course(s), I better understand world affairs.	____
15. My Future Think course(s) has helped me to plan my own career more intelligently.	____
16. A global perspective is necessary for everyone	____
17. More college courses should concentrate on the future.	____
18. I plan to take other courses in the Future Think Program.	____
19. This has been one of the best course experiences in my college career.	____

20. DO NOT USE THE RATING SCALE FOR THIS QUESTION:
For me, the most meaningful presentations were:

FIRST: _____

SECOND: _____

THIRD: _____

21. DO NOT USE THE RATING SCALE FOR THIS QUESTION:
For me, the most effective methods of presentation were:

FIRST: _____

SECOND: _____

THIRD: _____

Go on to the next page

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THIS IS NOT A TEST CONFIDENTIAL PROPRIETARY

DCM ASSOCIATES
908 FOX PLAZA
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 9410[illegible]

BLOCK E: ALL STUDENTS MUST COMPLETE THIS BLOCK.

Finally, we wish to have your specific recommendations about what should be added to or deleted from the Future Think Program next year. Please use the separate spaces provided below, one space for each course in which you were enrolled:

Course Number_____

Topics which should be ADDED: _____

_____

_____

_____

Topics which should be DELETED: _____

_____

_____

_____

Course Number_____

Topics which should be ADDED:_____

_____

_____

_____

Topics which should be DELETED: _____

_____

_____

_____

Course Number _____

Topics which should be ADDED:_____

_____

_____

_____

Topics which should be DELETED: _____

_____

_____

_____

(NOTE: If you were enrolled in more than three Future Think courses, please use the back of this sheet to give your recommendations for the other courses.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONFIDENTIAL
PROPRIETARY THIS IS NOT A TEST!

DCM ASSOCIATES
903 FOX PLAZA
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 9110?

BLOCK E: ALL STUDENTS MUST COMPLETE THIS BLOCK.

Apart from the actual Future Think course(s) you took this semester, we would also like to have your general recommendations for the program's future development. For example, we'd like to have your thoughts on the following points:

1. What new courses should be offered?
2. Which of your other instructors would you like to have offer a Future Think course?
3. What different kinds of presentations would you like to see tried?
4. What community resource speakers would you like to have invited to participate in Future Think?
5. What books, films, or other materials would you like to see used in Future Think?

Those are just a few typical questions about which we would like to have your views. Please answer them--or any other questions that may occur to you--in the blank space provided below. (Use the back of the sheet if you need more space.)

That completes this Future Think Evaluation Questionnaire. DCM Associates wishes to express our appreciation to you for your contribution. Be assured that your suggestions will be carefully considered and reflected in our recommendations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION of HUMAN RIGHTS

On DECEMBER 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the full text of which appears in the following pages. Following this historic act the Assembly called upon all Member countries to publicize the text of the Declaration and "to cause it to be disseminated, displayed, read and expounded principally in schools and other educational institutions, without distinction based on the political status of countries or territories."

Final Authorized Text

UNITED NATIONS

OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION

OF HUMAN RIGHTS

PREAMBLE

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,

Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations,

Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

APPENDIX D

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

proclaims

THIS UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

Article 1. All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2. Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 4. No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Article 5. No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 6. Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 7. All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 8. Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 10. Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11. (1) Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.

(2) No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.

Article 12. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his hon-

our and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 13. (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

(2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14. (1) Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

(2) This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15. (1) Everyone has the right to a nationality.

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

Article 16. (1) Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

(2) Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

(3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 17. (1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Article 19. Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20. (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

(2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 21. (1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

(2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22. Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23. (1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

(4) Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24. Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25. (1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

(2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Article 26. (1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

Article 27. (1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

(2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28. Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29. (1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

(2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

(3) These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 30. Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

APPENDIX E

Articles Related to Topics Actually Covered

ARTICLE	SOC. 13	ENG. 69	HIST. 50	SOC. 10	BIO. 63	PSY. 94	ENG. 1A	ENG. 1B	LANG. 1	TOTAL
1	25	11	19	20	10	10	5	9	3	112
2	13	7	16	34	8	4	1	6	3	92
3	8	5	8	11	8	4	2	4	6	56
4	3	1	11	5	1	0	1	2	2	26
5	0	1	2	1	2	0	4	1	1	12
6	4	1	1	5	0	2	1	0	0	14
7	2	0	6	12	0	0	3	1	0	24
8	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
9	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
10	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
11	0	1	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	7
12	9	2	1	4	0	0	0	2	1	19
13	3	2	4	4	5	0	0	1	1	20
14	0	0	3	1	0	0	2	1	1	8
15	1	0	5	5	1	1	0	0	1	14
16	28	9	1	47	10	23	3	4	2	127
17	8	3	1	1	11	1	1	0	2	28
18	9	5	3	9	5	5	6	7	0	49
19	7	4	3	1	6	9	9	5	0	44
20	1	1	2	5	3	1	0	0	1	14
21	1	2	10	4	17	1	2	1	1	39
22	4	1	1	10	6	2	1	2	1	28
23	8	6	1	6	5	2	1	1	2	32
24	19	4	2	3	2	0	1	1	0	32
25	18	7	6	15	42	9	1	2	4	104
26	12	6	2	28	8	2	5	5	7	75
27	6	4	1	9	10	0	0	3	2	35
28	1	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	7
29	6	3	3	3	14	2	1	3	1	36
30	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	5

NO REPLY TO A, 62--did not respond to at least one Article
NO REPLY TO B, 96--did not respond to a second Article
NO REPLY TO C, 129--did not respond to a third Article

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX F

Topics Not Covered Which Should Have Been

ARTICLE	SOC. 13	ENG. 69	HIST. 50	SOC. 10	BIO. 63	PSY. 94	ENG. 1A	ENG. 1B	LANG. 1	TOTAL
1	6	1	0	5	6	2	0	0	1	21
2	5	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	11
3	2	2	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	9
4	4	1	0	6	1	1	1	1	3	18
5	6	3	2	3	2	1	0	1	0	18
6	2	1	0	3	0	2	0	1	0	9
7	6	3	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	14
8	3	0	1	2	0	1	0	3	0	9
9	4	0	0	6	2	0	1	0	0	13
10	2	0	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	9
11	7	2	3	5	1	0	0	2	0	20
12	5	1	0	8	4	1	0	1	1	21
13	7	2	7	2	3	0	0	2	3	26
14	10	4	7	5	3	1	0	2	2	34
15	7	5	1	7	1	1	2	2	2	28
16	2	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	7
17	4	1	5	2	4	2	1	1	0	20
18	4	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	14
19	3	1	3	3	3	2	1	1	2	19
20	1	0	0	5	2	1	0	2	1	12
21	6	2	1	6	2	1	1	0	0	19
22	1	8	3	6	6	2	0	1	0	27
23	4	3	2	7	3	1	2	0	0	22
24	0	1	1	2	1	4	0	0	0	9
25	3	5	2	9	2	5	1	1	0	28
26	4	1	3	3	7	2	1	1	3	25
27	5	1	2	6	3	0	0	0	1	18
28	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	7
29	2	2	0	8	5	2	1	1	0	21
30	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	6

NO REPLY TO A, 238--did not respond to at least one Article
NO REPLY TO B, 278--did not respond to a second Article
NO REPLY TO C, 323--did not respond to a third Article
NO REPLY TO COURSE(S) TAKEN & NO REPLY TO ARTICLES, 37

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX G

Results from Block B, Future Think Program Questionnaire,
San Jose City College, Spring Semester, 1974

The total number of students is: 367
The average age of all students is: 27.553
The average number of years of school is: 13.950
The number of students taking one course is: 265
The number of students taking two courses is: 74
The number of students taking three courses is: 10
The number of students taking four courses is: 3
The number of students taking five courses is: 0

Item:	Number:	Percentage of all students in Program:	Percentage of all employed:
Female	158	43.052 %	
Male	204	55.586 %	
Employed	266	72.480 %	
Not employed	100	27.248 %	
No reply	1	0.273 %	
Fulltime emp.	172		64.662 %
Parttime emp.	90		33.835 %
No reply	4		1.504 %
Professional	66		24.812 %
Technical	63		23.684 %
Semi skilled	104		39.098 %
Unskilled	28		10.526 %
No reply	5		1.880 %
Ph.D.	26	7.084 %	
M.A.	66	17.984 %	
M.S.	14	3.815 %	
B.A.	117	31.880 %	
B.S.	57	15.531 %	
A.A.	49	13.351 %	
Certificate	6	1.635 %	
No degree	14	3.815 %	
Other	13	3.542 %	
No reply	5	1.362 %	
Biology 63	89	24.251 %	
English 1 A	23	6.267 %	
English 1 B	20	5.450 %	
English 69	32	8.719 %	
History 50	55	14.986 %	
Language 1	25	6.812 %	
Psychology 94	46	12.534 %	
Sociology 10	97	26.431 %	
Sociology 13	71	19.346 %	
No reply	15	4.087 %	

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 07 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION